





## BUSINESS NOTICES.

No receipts are sent from this office. As our terms are strictly cash in advance, the receipt of the paper will be a sufficient acknowledgment that the money has been received.

In making up clubs for the *National Era*, it is not required that subscribers shall all be at the same post office.

Persons sending us clubs can always make additions to the same at the regular club prices.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1852.

## THE FRIEND OF YOUTH.

Contents for January.—ORIGINAL.—I remember, by Mrs. Gage; Zeke and Hannah's Education Fund, by Martha Russell; Nature and Worldly Wisdom, by the Editor; The Schoolmistress, by Mary Irving; A Hebrew Relic, by the Editor; Lessons for the Season, by the Editor; Lines, &c., by Anna; Letter from Aunt Fanny; Christmas at a Boys' Boarding School, by Mary Irving.

There is besides a fine variety of selected articles.

The *Friend of Youth* is published monthly in Washington, by Mrs. M. L. Bailey, at fifty cents a year. Its pages are chiefly filled with original matter, from paid contributors.

We call attention to the advertisement in this week's *Era*, of Philemon Bliss.

## THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON—GOVERNOR KOSUTH.

In accordance with the proceedings of a meeting of citizens of various States, held on the 7th, at the Irving Hotel, Chancellor Walworth was requested to present to Kosuth resolutions and an address, sympathizing with him and his mission. The deputation waited upon him last Friday, when the Chancellor in behalf of the meeting presented an address, which was responded to by Governor Kosuth in a speech of considerable length and great strength. Chancellor Walworth so far forgot the proprieties of the time and place, as to reflect offensively upon the conduct not only of the People of Washington, but of a certain portion of the People of the United States. "If you have not been welcomed," said he, "by the municipal authorities of this District with the same cordiality which has been and will be hereafter manifested elsewhere, I presume you will attribute it to the social influence which the residence of the diplomatic agents of so many arbitrary Governments may naturally be supposed to have over a mere parcel of the permanent and limited population of the District of Columbia."

Resolutions in favor of Kosuth passed one branch of the municipal authorities of the District, but were stultified or defeated in the other. The secret influence which produced this result, emanated not from the presence here of foreign ministers, but we fear, from Catholic counsels. We do not speak positively, but we have reason for our remark.

In so far as the imputation of Chancellor Walworth bears against our citizens, it is grossly unjust. There has not been so much noise and parade here as in New York, in honoring Governor Kosuth; but it must be remembered that our city is a mere village, compared with the commercial metropolis, numbering not a twelfth part of its population. Kosuth has no ground of complaint against the hospitality of the citizens. He has been cordially received. Deputation after deputation, representing different classes and interests, has waited upon him, to assure him of their high respect, their sincere sympathy, and their general concurrence in his principles; and certainly the crowd of visitors daily has been more than he could gratify.

The tone of a portion of the press in other cities towards Washington and all that it contains, seems to us capricious, unjust, unkind. Now, Congress is bitterly denounced, then, the Executive Departments, then, the citizens—denounced without reason. Why cannot our contemporaries be discriminated in their censures? Do they not know that there is no proposition of an important character, that can pass both Houses of our National Legislature, without more or less discussion? Must the great majority of both Houses be held responsible for the over-scrupulousness, or folly, of a few individual members? We do not regret the debate that took place on the question of the mode of receiving Kosuth. It has served to attract the attention of the People to the principles represented by the Hungarian exile, and to the subject generally of our foreign relations. It has developed a new form of opposition to Progress, assumed by the Slave Power in its antagonism to Liberty. And the resolutions in favor of Kosuth, carried at last by triumphant majorities, were rendered by the preceding debate far more significant than they would have been if passed by tacit consent, and merely as a matter of form.

Then, as to the action of the Executive Departments. The nations of Europe will not think a moment of the warmth or coldness with which Kosuth was welcomed. Their attention will be fixed upon the great fact, that a political refugee from Austrian oppression, proscribed, hated, feared, by the Despots of the Old World, is formally received, honored, entertained by the Republican Government of the New World—received, honored, and entertained, precisely because he is such a refugee—because he has confronted and resisted those Despots. That fact alone speaks defiance and rebuke to Austria and Russia, and a God-speed to the Revolutionists of Europe.

Of course, Congress and the Executive must expect to have their conduct reviewed and judged by the People. Plain speaking is the right of the Press. It does no more than its duty in watching the proceedings of the Government, and in rebuking in them what it believes wrong. But just and discriminating censure is one thing—wholesale denunciation is another. After all, there is a certain respect due to the Representatives of the American People, and to the men chosen by them, as the types of their sovereignty. It seems to us that we should be careful, for the sake of cultivating a proper respect for Law among the People, and maintaining the reputation of republican institutions abroad, to guard against attempts to disparage our Government, or to bring it into disrepute or contempt.

As to the citizens of Washington, they ought not to be held responsible for the course of the *National Intelligencer*. Generally it has perhaps more influence with them than any single press here, but in relation to Governor Kosuth, it has not represented or controlled their opinions. The great Hungarian carries with him from his spot the deep sympathies, and earnest, God be with you! of the great mass of our population.

The *Intelligencer* repels, with great indignation, the imputation of Chancellor Walworth, but, with its characteristic want of friendliness towards Kosuth, omits to say anything of the beautiful, most impressive vindication of the People of Washington, contained in the reply of Kosuth—a vindication far more satisfactory than the resentful language of that paper.

"You have been pleased," said Kosuth, "to

allude to the circumstance that here, in the District of Columbia, I have not been honored by such an attention as I was in other places and parts of the United States. You have been pleased to attribute this circumstance to certain influences of certain men. Now, I, indeed, have the opinion that it is not that influence. I cannot believe, skillful as Russian diplomacy may be—indeed, it is very skillful—that it has such influence. Let me, for instance, take as an example Moldavia, where all the different representatives of Russian diplomacy have received orders from their Government to court the favor of Moldavian ladies, and to marry them. [Laughter.] Every step—even the marriage of a Russian diplomatist—is always a diplomatic movement. [Laughter.] I have mentioned this respect to Moldavia; but, indeed, I cannot believe that, however great that skill may be, it could have any influence, in whatever part of the United States, upon the public spirit of freemen, as you are. [Applause.] I believe, rather, that there is another reason for this circumstance—though, indeed, I believe that there are steps taken even to honor me here. The reason, I believe, that, so far as I know, your Constitution—the Constitution of the United States—being a system of checks and balances, the principle was considered to be a wise one—and I, in my conviction, also take it to be wise—that it is not good that a corporation in the midst of which the highest authorities of the State have a residence, Executive and Legislative power—when the district or city has a very much developed public life, which now and then could influence, by pressure from without, the proceedings of the constituted authorities—should take any very active steps in popular proceedings. This was indeed the fact in several places in Europe—where we have seen the streets ruled in the councils of the land. The framers of your Constitution were willing to avoid such an influence as this, which of course concentrates that power which only the whole people has—concentrates it practically, now and then, in a single man, and in a single city as it was often in Paris. The consequence of this was, that the inhabitants of the District of Columbia are placed somewhat in an exceptional condition in comparison with other parts. They have no self-government of their own, and exercise not the right of voting, if I am rightly informed. Now, this position which I consider to be a very wise one, and in which harmony with the principle of checks and balances, of course have had the influence that the public life is not and cannot be developed so much here in this District as elsewhere. That is the only explanation which I take. But this, however, was no impediment to the Chancellor's remarks, and benefit of private expressions of very kind feelings and sentiments of the inhabitants of this District—from different parts, of it, but chiefly from the city of Washington. From the first to the last moment, they have been generous and kind sympathy from the inhabitants of this District. Now, you will excuse me for having what I believe to be a full motive in differing with you in explanation of that fact."

How could such an appeal be resisted? Nothing is more certain than that, if England be forced into a conflict with the combined Despots of Europe, it will react upon our domestic institutions, by developing, and finally giving preponderance to, the Democratic or Republican element. Antagonism to Absolutism would compel her aristocracy to rely upon the masses of the country, and this it could not do, without concessions to their reasonable demands. In such a struggle, her institutions would become liberalized, the voice of the people would become omnipotent, and who does not see that the interests of Ireland would be better consulted? Justice would be done, if for nothing else, to secure the good will and hearty support of the Irish people in the formidable battle for the liberties of mankind. And should the United States be brought into close fellowship with England, that fact of itself would tend to promote a wider, more considerate, legislation in regard to Ireland.

It is strange that our naturalized Irish citizens cannot understand this intimate connection between the influence of the public opinion of the other. The closer the connection between England and the United States, the more influential her public opinion in regard to the wrongs of our colored population, the more operative our public opinion in regard to the wrongs of Ireland. Arranged against one another by mutual jealousy and prejudice, the peculiar sentiments of each on general topics are rejected and repelled by the other. What possible good can our Irish-American population propose to accomplish for their native land by producing alienation and exasperation between this country and England? They cannot expect to drive us into a war to redress the wrongs of Ireland; so that the only effect of their unreasonable course is to render England inaccessible to many powerful influences in favor of their country, which would be exerted constantly by the United States, if closely connected with England by mutual regard and sympathy.

## THE FRATERNITY OF THE PEOPLE OF ALL NATIONS.

Kosuth, in his speech at the Democratic Banquet, pronounced a sentiment which deserves to be written in letters of gold: "Hated is a good counselor, gentlemen. The wisdom of love is a better one." He understands the antipathies prevalent among some of our countrymen against England, how they are aggravated by the Irish element in our population, and nurtured by demagogues, who are accustomed to play upon popular passions, no matter how unworthy, for the advancement of their own selfish ends. At the Congressional Banquet, Mr. Douglas indulged in a tirade against England, protesting against any fraternization with her till justice should be done to Ireland. Suppose leading politicians in that country should take similar ground, and labor to array her people against the United States until justice should be done to the three millions of slaves within our borders? These attempts to kindle or keep alive national antipathies are repugnant to the sound statesmanship, to the morality of Christianity, to the claims of human brotherhood. The People of all lands are brethren—they have common rights, common interests, and therefore should cultivate sentiments of fraternity.

We have watched the tone of the English press, read the speeches of the leaders of the people of England, and can bear testimony that they manifest a friendship towards the United States, which is far from being reciprocated by us as it ought to be. Even were this not so, it were well to set them an example of fraternal feeling. We admire the man who suffers no prejudice, no imaginary interest, no caprice, to affect his judgment of others, and who, whatever may be their conduct, always acts towards them, not in obedience to the dictates of passion or selfishness, but in accordance with his own unbiased sense of what is right. We call him a just, generous, magnanimous man. Antipathies are infirmities. Prejudice is a slavery to which no generous mind will submit. What is true of the individual man is true of that aggregate of men we call a nation. It should be ashamed to be controlled by passion, by prejudice, by any kind of antipathy. It should inquire only what Justice, Humanity, and Enlightened Self-Interest, require.

The appeal of Kosuth to the Democratic Association, in behalf of good feeling towards the English People, was frank, strikingly impressive, and we are glad to say, responded to with warm enthusiasm.

"And," said he, "let me humbly entreat your permission for one single moment more. I received, during my brief stay in England, some one hundred and thirty addresses from cities and associations, all full of the warmest sympathy for my country's cause, which you so generously support. That sympathy was accorded to me notwithstanding my frank declaration that I am a republican, and that my country, restored to independence, can be nothing else but a republic. Now, indeed, this is a fact gratifying to every friend of progress in England's land a mighty continent, is openly acknowledged even by the English people itself. The memory of the glorious day of New Orleans must of course recall to your mind the memory of the day against which you so gloriously fought. Oh, let us not entreat you to bury the hatred of past ages in the grave, where all the crimes of the past lie buried with the mouldering ashes of those who sinned, and take the glorious opportunity to benefit the great cause of humanity."

"One thing let me tell you, gentlemen. People and Governments are different things in such a country as Great Britain. It is sorrowful enough that the people have often to pay for what the Government sinned. Let it not be said in history that even the people of the United States made a kindred people pay for what its Government sinned. And, remember that you can mightily react upon the public opinion of Britannia, and that the people of Britannia can react upon the course of its own Government. It were, indeed, a great misfortune to see the Government of Great Britain puny by its attitude to side with absolutism against the oppressed nations about to struggle for independence and liberty. Even Ireland could only lose by this. And, besides, its own loss, this could, perhaps, be just the de-

cisive blow against liberty; whereas the Government of England, let it be as it is, uniting in the direction not to allow foreign interference with our struggle, would be a sure guarantee of the victory of those struggles; and, according to circumstances, this would be indeed the most practical benefit to the noble people of Ireland, because freedom, independence, and the principles of nature's law, could not fail to benefit their own cause, which so well merits the sympathy of every just man; and they have also the sympathy—I know it—of the better half of England itself.

Hated is no good counselor, gentlemen. The wisdom of love is a better one. What people has suffered more than my poor Hungary has from Russia? Shall I hate the people of Russia for it? Oh, never! I have but pity and Christian brotherly love for it. It is the Government, it is the principle of the Government, which every drop of my blood boils, and which must fall if humanity shall live. We were for centuries in war against the Turks, and God knows what we have suffered by it. But past is past. Now we have a common enemy, and thus we have a common interest, a mutual sentiment, and love rules where hatred would have reigned.

How could such an appeal be resisted? Nothing is more certain than that, if England be forced into a conflict with the combined Despots of Europe, it will react upon our domestic institutions, by developing, and finally giving preponderance to, the Democratic or Republican element. Antagonism to Absolutism would compel her aristocracy to rely upon the masses of the country, and this it could not do, without concessions to their reasonable demands. In such a struggle, her institutions would become liberalized, the voice of the people would become omnipotent, and who does not see that the interests of Ireland would be better consulted? Justice would be done, if for nothing else, to secure the good will and hearty support of the Irish people in the formidable battle for the liberties of mankind. And should the United States be brought into close fellowship with England, that fact of itself would tend to promote a wider, more considerate, legislation in regard to Ireland.

It is strange that our naturalized Irish citizens cannot understand this intimate connection between the influence of the public opinion of the other. The closer the connection between England and the United States, the more influential her public opinion in regard to the wrongs of our colored population, the more operative our public opinion in regard to the wrongs of Ireland. Arranged against one another by mutual jealousy and prejudice, the peculiar sentiments of each on general topics are rejected and repelled by the other. What possible good can our Irish-American population propose to accomplish for their native land by producing alienation and exasperation between this country and England? They cannot expect to drive us into a war to redress the wrongs of Ireland; so that the only effect of their unreasonable course is to render England inaccessible to many powerful influences in favor of their country, which would be exerted constantly by the United States, if closely connected with England by mutual regard and sympathy.

We have no patience with the demagogues who, in districts where the votes of our Irish naturalized citizens may determine an election, instead of appealing to their sense of right and their love of liberty, instead of striving to educate them to exercise the rights of freemen in obedience to the spirit of humanity and the dictates of an enlightened self-interest, are forever pandering to their lower sentiments—feeding their hate, inflaming their vindictive passions, by dwelling upon the wrongs they once suffered at the hand of their countrymen, thus nurturing antipathies that should die the moment they find a home and a country in this New World. All their eloquence against English oppression is a mockery; all their sympathy for Irish wrongs is hypocrisy. Were Ireland sunk in the depths of the sea to-morrow, they would not shed a tear, nor heave a sigh, unless they could catch a stray vote by their tender demonstration. Not one straw do they care for their Irish constituents, any further than they can use them for political purposes; and the readiest mode, they think, of making them serve these purposes is, by aggravating their evil passions.

Such demagogues should be unmasked and disgraced. They are enemies to our naturalized citizens, by seeking to make them the slaves of blind antipathies, and to their own country, by endeavoring to perpetuate in its borders resentments and prejudices which have nothing to do with our institutions, and can but tend to vitiate our national character and impede our national progress.

## DEMOCRATIC FESTIVAL—EIGHTH OF JANUARY.

The Eighth of January was commemorated in this city by a Banquet, (under the auspices of the Democratic Association,) at which Kosuth was present as an invited guest. The Hall was tastefully decorated, and nearly five hundred ladies and gentlemen were seated at its liberally-furnished tables. The members of Congress of the Democratic faith were there, among whom we observed Messrs. Cass, Houston, Douglas, King, Cleveland, and Ransom. Mr. Francis P. Blair, by order of the Association, read an address to Kosuth, and the following toast was drunk with unbounded enthusiasm:

"The exiles of Europe—Liberty and Louis Kosuth!"

This brought out the illustrious guest, who, taking a central position in the Hall, addressed the audience in a speech as beautiful as it was sagacious, which quite carried away every listener. The tact of Governor Kosuth is as remarkable as his eloquence. He seems to understand, by intuition, his audience, and soon makes himself master of every avenue to their hearts and understandings. An examination of his two speeches, which we publish on our outside pages, one delivered at the Congressional Banquet, the other at the Democratic Celebration, will show how admirably he can adapt himself to circumstances, and make them minister to his purposes. This he does without compromising his principles, without practicing a blind reserve, without resorting to evasion, ambiguity, or vague generalities. Everybody must be won by the noble frankness and boldness with which he avows his principles and policy, and though not prepared to accede to his demands, profoundly respect the modest firmness with which he urges them.

The toasts which followed his speech were spirited and pertinent, and the soul-stirring music that responded to them was infinitely better than the oratory so common upon such occasions. But there was some speaking. Mr. Cass being called for, delivered himself briefly, with some earnestness, complimenting their guest, and speaking warmly of his cause, though without committing himself very decidedly to any particular course of measures.

Mr. Douglas followed, and, forgetting all about Intervention and Non-Intervention, Freedom and Despotism, International Laws and International Obligations, plunged into the depths of partisan warfare, and was soon lost in a chaos of obligations and exhortations about Cuban Patriots, continent and incontinent annexation, Democracy, Whiggery, Abolitionism, Disunionism, and other matters equally edifying and entertaining to the Hungarian gentlemen present. The taste, to say

nothing of the patriotism, representing nearly one-half the American People as sectional and hostile to their country, in the presence of distinguished foreigners; of juggling upon the attention of these homeless exiles, saddened by remembrances of their country's overthrow and the triumph of Despotism over democratic braves and conflicts, was extremely questionable. Jackson's memory would have been better honored by eloquent appeals to the American People to support in every legitimate way the cause of European Freedom and the obligations imposed by the Law of Nations.

But Mr. Douglas was applauded, and he was satisfied—not taking the trouble to solve the question, how much champagne had to do with the hurrahs of his listeners.

A toast was prepared for General Houston, but precedence was given to Mr. Douglas, whose long speech left no time for the General, and, in consequence of indisposition, he was obliged to retire without making a speech. Was this designed? Were the managers of the Festival willing to allow Messrs. Cass and Douglas an opportunity of talking too much for their good?

## MOVEMENTS OF KOSUTH.—Kosuth left this city for Annapolis last Monday morning at 8 o'clock. From that place he will proceed to Baltimore, Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, &amp;c. Resolutions of welcome and invitation have been passed by the Legislatures of Vermont, Massachusetts, Indiana, and Tennessee, and other State Legislatures are preparing to pass similar resolves. Only a part of his suite will accompany him to the West.

## LORD PALMERSTON'S RESIGNATION.

Lord Palmerston's retirement from the British Ministry is the engrossing topic of late English papers. The causes assigned are various. Some say it is attributable chiefly to the long-standing hostility of Lord Grey, who, merely made use of the position of Palmerston, in relation to Russia and Austria, as a pretext for presenting the alternative of his own or the Foreign Secretary's withdrawal. Some allege that the friendship shown by Palmerston towards the Hungarian cause had placed England in an attitude of antagonism to Austria, and his retirement was therefore rendered necessary, to change this relation of hostility. Others report that the secret police of Louis Napoleon, that arrested Changarnier and Cavaignac, found a voluminous correspondence of Lord Palmerston, in which the British Government was represented as sincerely sympathizing with the Republic, and hostile to the pretensions and character of Louis Napoleon; and yet Palmerston is understood to have rather approved of the coup d'état by which Napoleon dispersed the Assembly and became master of the French People, willing to find in the Military Government an ally against the new Holy Alliance.

We presume that at present nothing certain can be known by the public. It is quite possible that, by the force of circumstances, the relations of Great Britain with other Powers, both liberal and despotic, may have become unpleasantly complicated; that the responsibility of this is fastened upon Lord Palmerston, who is known to be a bold, decided, independent man; that his old enemies in the Cabinet have used the occasion against him, and that his friends, for the sake of securing harmony, and with a view to make the attitude of England on the Hungarian question and other kindred topics less obnoxious to foreign Powers, have consented to his retirement, without thereby contemplating an essential change of policy; for his successor, Lord Granville, is said to possess tendencies decidedly liberal—more so on many points of general politics than those either of Lord Clarendon or Lord Palmerston.

## FOREIGN RELATIONS—NON-INTERVENTION.

On the 2d instant a memorial was presented in the Senate by Mr. Walker, from the Industrial Congress assembled in New York, requesting the recall of Mr. Rives, our Minister at Paris, and the suspension of diplomatic intercourse with Louis Napoleon. We presume the object of the memorial was to secure the passage of a resolution by Congress, recommending the recall of the Chief Executive. The ground upon which the memorialists rested their petition was, the fact of the violent subversion of the Constitution and Liberties of the French people, and the establishment of a Military Despotism, by Louis Napoleon.

A warm discussion arose, in which it seemed to be conceded that the question of a change in our foreign policy must soon come under consideration. Those who were in favor of early consideration, advocated the reference of the memorial to the Committee on Foreign Relations; reference was opposed by those who favored postponement. Mr. Mason moved to lay the memorial on the table, and on this motion the vote stood—

Yea—Messrs. Atchison, Bell, Berrien, Boutwell, Chase, Douglass, Duffell, Edwards, Geyer, Gwin, Jones of Tennessee, King, Malory, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Rusk, Salisbury, Smith, and Underwood—21.

Nay—Messrs. Borland, Bradbury, Dodge of Wisconsin, Douglass, Edwards, Felch, Hamlin, Jones of Iowa, Norcross, Shields, Sumner, Wade, Walker, and Whitcomb—14.

The vote, as will be observed, is sectional, and is another proof that the greatest obstacle to the interposition of the power of this country in favor of Liberty abroad, is Slavery at home. Of the twenty-one votes to lay upon the table the memorial, four only are from free States—Messrs. Clarke, Cooper, Gwin, and Smith; and of the fourteen against laying it upon the table, only one, Mr. Borland, is from a slave State. Among these fourteen is but one Whig.

We note these sectional and party features of the vote, as indicating the quarter from which is to come the effort to place our Government in its foreign relations actively on the side of Human Liberty. On this point there is no harmony between the Southern and Northern Democracy. Slaveholding Democrats abhor Intervention for Freedom abroad, and will compel their Northern allies to check their tendencies on this point, or they will part company with them.

We are glad to learn that Mr. Rives, our Minister, has declined to recognize the usurpation of Louis Napoleon, until instructed by his Government. The following, from the Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia *North American*, communicates, we presume, authentic information:

"WASHINGTON, January 4, 1852.

"Despatches have been received at the State Department, from Mr. Rives, up to the 18th ult., which express the opinion that the coup d'état of Louis Napoleon was a complete revolutionary movement, and furnish details similar to those already published. Mr. Rives and the Swiss Minister were the only members of the diplomatic corps who had declined to attend the President's levee, and the latter had finally resolved to present himself. The views of the Administration on the whole subject will be forwarded to Mr. Rives immediately."

The conduct of Mr. Rives will receive the approbation of the American People, as the representative of a Republic, he was bound to manifest his displeasure at the subversion of a Republic. We know not what the views of the Administration may be, but we hope that Mr. Rives has been instructed to maintain his

position, until indubitable evidence is furnished that the French People have ratified the usurpation. The usurpation is of so recent date, its success is so uncertain, the evidences of popular discontent are so plain, that our Government may well delay action until it be ascertained that France has a Government, assented to, if not sanctioned, by the People.

## A MERCIFUL MEMORIAL—FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.

An interesting debate took place on the 7th, in the Senate, on a memorial praying the restoration of flogging as a part of the naval discipline. Commodore Stockton opposed the memorial in a well-considered speech, marked by good sense and generous feeling. He placed himself on the broad ground that an American sailor was an American citizen, and ought not to be degraded by so infamous a punishment as that of the lash. Infinitely more could be done by retraining him for faithfulness, than by punishing him for his delinquencies. His testimony confirmed what is generally admitted, that drunkenness was the principal offence for which the lash was administered; but the penalty failed to produce reformation.

How could it be otherwise? How is intemperance to be remedied, except by quickening the self-respect and elevating the moral sentiments of the man? But the lash degrades him, destroys his self-respect, and tends to make him reckless of all obligations, human and divine. The fact is, that it is only of late years that the truth that the sailor is a man, has been forcing itself upon the convictions of the People and of Congress. We doubt whether it is yet generally recognized by the officers of the navy. Certainly the discipline of a man-of-war regards him not so much a human being, as an instrument for applying a match, or using a boarding party. A chaplain is provided to say prayers, and read sermons, little adapted to his comprehension or demands, but no provision is made for the rational enjoyment or occupation of his hours of leisure, so that he wastes it in vicious talk, or seeks by every means to gratify his taste for stimulants.

Mr. Badger, of North Carolina, could see nothing so dreadful in the use of the lash. "The poet has said that herodians would follow the nose of Orpheus, but ordinary herodians in those days used the good to urge their flock along." The fable would apply if sailors were brutes, but they are just as human as the Senator himself, who are inclined to think, would not regard the good as the proper corrector of his faults, or as the best stimulus in his own case to good behavior. Banish rum from the navy, let the officers set an example of temperance, let ample libraries be furnished to every vessel for the use of the men, let them have the means and the opportunities of self-improvement and rational amusement, let their accommodations for eating and sleeping be adapted to the wants of human beings, let the discipline be regular, strict, ascertained, not oppressive, capricious, uncertain: in a word, let American Sailors be regarded and treated as American citizens, and the harp of Orpheus will not be needed to win obedience and subordination.

## FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE, JANUARY 7, 1852.

Senator Stockton, of New Jersey, made an effective speech on Wednesday against the memorial asking that the use of the lash be restored to the Navy. He said that he was utterly and irreconcilably opposed to the use of the lash in the navy. He said that the prevalence of the idea that our national ships cannot be navigated without a resort to the lash was attributed to the fact that the life of the sailor has been one of habitual, he would not say of systematic, degradation. He who is liable to be treated like a brute soon becomes to be thought of as but little better than a brute. One of the worst evils of the system is that it destroys those feelings of respect and kindness which officers ought to entertain for the sailors under their command.

"The truth is," said he, "there are no relations of affection and regard between them. The one is the oppressor, the other the oppressed. Sir, a man may fear or hate, but he will never love nor respect his tyrant. The worst government upon earth is that of fear, the best, that of love and affection. These sentiments, by a law of our nature, must be mutual sentiments. Bonaparte was the idol of the soldier, because the soldier was his idol. They loved him because they supposed he loved them. There is nothing that gallant and brave men will not do and suffer for, a commander whom they love. Difficulties and dangers and death have no terrors for such men. In great battles, where the contest has been doubtful, he would soldiers have always fought most desperately whose devotion to their commander was the greatest. It has always been considered as a successful element in the character of a successful commander, that he should be able to excite and encourage the confidence and affection of the men under his command. But what confidence or regard can be expected under the government of the lash? But more than this: this punishment destroys the sailor's own self-respect. What has honor, what has pride, what has patriotism, to do with a man who may be, at the caprice of another, subjected to an infamous punishment, worse—aye, sir, in some cases worse a thousand times than death? Can nobleness of sentiment, or any honorable pride of character, dwell with one whose every muscle has been made to quiver under the lash? Can he long continue to love his country, whose laws degrade him to the level of a brute? The infamous 'question' of torture now so rampant as a blot on the page of Anglo-Saxon history. The whipping-post, where the worst vagrants used to expiate their offences, has been transferred from earth to the sea, and the United States prisoners are no longer punished by the lash. Why is all this? Why are these punishments now condemned as the shameful relic of a barbarous age? It is because the light of a better era has dawned. It is because the precepts of the Gospel of Christianity have ameliorated our laws. It is because society has made the discovery, that if a man is fit to live, all he ought not to be devoted to all the qualities which make a man, by the infamous mutilation of his body. What is the answer which is given to all this by those who seek to restore this relic of barbarism to the Navy? They tell us we intend only to apply this system of punishment to seamen—we intend only to flog sailors. That is quite true. It is only sailors who are to be treated like brutes—aye, sir, worse than brutes. There is no man who hears me who would permit his dog to be thus treated. There is no spot on the habitable globe, known to me, where a man would be permitted to seize upon a dog, and lash him until he cut the flesh from off his ribs, and the blood should be made to run down from his backbone to his heels. But, sir, it is only the sailor, for whom this punishment is to be restored."

He stated that he had been the companion of sailors for more than a quarter of a century, through calm and storm, privations, sufferings, and danger. He stood up as the sailor's advocate. He referred to the offences for which the lash has been inflicted, and gave it as his opinion that stopping the offender's allowance of tobacco or rum, tea, sugar, and coffee, would be in every case a much more reasonable and a more efficient punishment. He said that "The difficulty in regard to this matter has been, that in framing articles for the government of the Navy, three things have been overlooked, which ought never to be lost sight of. First, that the American sailor is an American man and a freeman, though in the service of his country. Second, that he has yielded no legal right, not inconsistent with his obligations of duty. Third, that naval officers are not infallible, and require as stringent regulations

for their government as other citizens invested with authority."

He added: "We hear a great deal of the delinquencies of sailors. There are delinquencies of officers, as well as of sailors. There are officers in the Navy, as well as sailors, who ought not to be there. If you desire to prepare the Navy for the exigencies of war, if you desire to preserve your ancient renown as a naval power, you must, in my judgment, abolish the lash, and adopt a system of rewards and punishments in its stead. You must abolish the liquor ration; you must alter the whole system of the recruiting service; in one word, you must purge the Navy of all its foul stuff, in high places as well as low places; and you must lay broad and deep the foundation of your naval greatness in the character of the common sailor."

Mr. Badger dissented from the views of Mr. Stockton, as did Mr. Mallory. Mr. Gwin expressed a desire to give his views on the question, when the further consideration of the subject was postponed until Monday.

## A GYURMAN AND HIS JOURNAL.

We have seen the first number of a newspaper, printed in German, and issued in New York, by A. Gyurman & F. Wutsche. The first-named gentleman was formerly connected with Kosuth in the publication of a newspaper in Hungary, and was subsequently the editor of the official paper of his Government. As an introduction to the American Public, he inserts in his first number the following note from Governor Kosuth:

"NEW YORK, December 22, 1851.

"Upon your inquiry, in which way you could serve the cause of your fatherland, and that of liberty, in your present position as an exile, I reply, that you could essentially serve the cause to which you have devoted yourself for many years with so much talent, perseverance, and patriotism, if, particularly now, when the struggle between freedom and despotism has been renewed, you could open the path of journalism, on which you gained for yourself so honorable a position—firmly convinced that your industry will be congratulated and accompanied by the merited sympathy of all lovers of freedom."

"Mr. Adolph Gyurman, late editor of the official paper, Kozelecz."

The number of the paper containing this note has also the Prospectus, which, after defining the position of the editors on Foreign Policy, states their views on domestic questions as follows:

"1. The slavery question. With regard to it, we consider the compromise no settled solution, but a provisional law, for the abolition of which, or at least for the restriction of slaves is concerned, we will employ all the means which a public organ can command."

"2. Land reform. We defend the principle of land reform, and contend against monopoly of the soil."

"3. The policy of the Union in respect to Central America. With reference to this point, we stand on the ground Monroe took, that every interference of European Powers in the affairs of the American Continent will unhesitatingly be rejected."

"4. The tariff question, and 5. that of internal improvements, (canals, rivers, and harbors.) As we do not raise these questions to the stand of our principles, but rather consider them questions of convenience, we give free discussion of the same in our paper."

"At all the elections we will, therefore, take particular notice of the three enumerated principles."

A mean attempt was made by the *New York Herald* to convict Kosuth of unfairness and inconsistency, by assuming that he was responsible for this Prospectus, because he wrote the note recommending Mr. Gyurman to publish a newspaper. This was as silly as it was mean. Kosuth merely recommended that he should devote himself to journalism, and did not undertake to prescribe what course he should take, or on what principles he should conduct his paper. No course of policy is marked out for him—Kosuth does not undertake to prescribe what shall be his platform of principles in regard to domestic questions, nor is there anything in the letter which makes him responsible for the conduct of any newspaper.

We observe in the newspapers a card from the Secretary of Kosuth, denying that he has any connection with the paper, any control over it, any responsibility for it.

"You are authorized to state that Governor Kosuth has no connection whatever with that paper. The facts are, briefly, that Mr. Gyurman applied for advice how best to occupy his time and serve the cause of his country. To this, Governor Kosuth replied (as may be seen by his letter) to this effect: 'You are a distinguished journalist; follow your profession, and you will thereby obtain opportunities of serving your country.'"

CONGRESSIONAL BANQUET.—The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia *North American* says of the Congressional Banquet, which took place on the evening of the 7th, in honor of Kosuth:

"The Congressional banquet last night was a grand and imposing affair, and exceeded any entertainment of the kind which I have ever witnessed here, except the complimentary dinner to Mr. Clay, on the occasion of his retirement from the Senate. It was served in admirable style, and conducted with a propriety and grace, that surpassed anything of the kind we have seen in this city. The spacious and beautiful ladies' ordinary of the National Hotel was gracefully decorated with appropriate flags. On a dais midway in the saloon, Mr. Kosuth was seated, between the presiding officers of the two Houses, with Mr. Webster on the extreme left. Every seat prepared for the occasion was occupied, and some were unexpectedly introduced."

The speech of Kosuth was one of the most finished productions of his pen, abounding in passages of beauty and pathos.







